

(128) years by preaching the gospel, singing the gospel and living the gospel; and

Whereas, Thankful Missionary Baptist Church has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who have shared not only with their Church, but with DeKalb County and the world their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Thankful Missionary Baptist Church family for their leadership and service to our District;

Now Therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim September 26, 2010, as Thankful Missionary Baptist Church Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, This 26th day of September, 2010.

HONORING POLICE OFFICER DAVID MOORE

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2011

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the hearts of Indianapolis residents are hurting right now because we have lost one of our true heroes in public safety. Police Officer David Moore passed away on January 26 after being shot on duty protecting the people of Indianapolis. Officer Moore answered his community's call to service when he joined the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department in 2004. Now, Officer Moore is moving on to a higher calling, as difficult as it may be for all of us to see him go.

There's no doubt Officer Moore knew the dangers of police work, as both of his parents were part of the IMPD family. But like so many who wear the badge in communities across our nation, David Moore took an oath to serve and protect others. To run to danger—not away from it. Officer Moore did just that, and our community is better and safer because of his service and sacrifice.

In honor of Officer Moore, let us never forget the daily sacrifices our law enforcement officers make in order to protect our families and neighborhoods. I ask my colleagues in Congress to pay respect to Officer Moore by going back to their districts and thanking their local law enforcement officers for the work they do and the daily dangers they place themselves in to protect us all.

I also ask the American people to join the city of Indianapolis in mourning the loss of this hero. Let us continue to keep Officer Moore's family and the entire law enforcement community in our thoughts and prayers.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS FOR
THE FAIRNESS FOR MILITARY
RECRUITERS ACT

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2011

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Fairness for Military Recruiters

Act, legislation to ensure that America's military recruiters are not denied or unfairly restricted access to high school campuses. Most students on the verge of completing high school undoubtedly think about the future. For some, immediately entering college is an option. Others choose to follow a different path, including taking full advantage of the benefits and educational opportunities offered through military service.

The intent of the Fairness for Military Recruiters Act is straightforward. The legislation simply reaffirms and strengthens existing federal law, enacted in 2002 under the No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Act, providing military recruiters the same access to high school campuses and basic student contact information that is provided to other institutions of higher education.

Before the enactment of NCLB, it was reported that nearly 2,000 high schools across the country either banned military recruiters from campuses or restricted access to student directories. In the years since the implementation of NCLB, despite early opposition from several school boards and administrators, most schools ultimately altered their policies and allowed some form of recruiter access.

Under current law, any high school that receives federal education funding must provide military recruiters access to its campus and student directory—the same access provided to colleges and universities. Schools are also required to notify parents and students of their right to "opt-out," which occurs when a parent or student 18 years of age requests not to be contacted by a military recruiter.

This is a balanced approach to ensuring that students are familiar with the multitude of education and career opportunities offered by any one of the military service branches. Military service promotes discipline and a strong work-ethic. Young Americans should not be discouraged from serving their country or, at the very least, considering the benefits of serving in the armed forces with the assistance of a military recruiter.

The American military is an all-volunteer force. Without patriotic and talented young Americans continuing to step forward, end-strength won't be the only thing adversely affected. So will American security.

Despite the necessity to recruit qualified candidates for the armed forces, there are some school administrators and activist groups who vehemently oppose the idea of military recruiters in high schools. There are reported instances of groups, known as "counter-recruiters," attending parent-teacher conferences and distributing opt-out forms. In one case last year, the New York Civil Liberties Union sent volunteers to stand outside 24 high schools, in the interest of discouraging students from interacting with military recruiters.

Others take a different approach. Amy Hagopian, a professor of Global Health at the University of Washington, who is equally committed to ending recruitment in high schools, wrote an article for the American Journal of Public Health that compares military recruiters with child sex predators. She alleges that military recruiter behavior is "disturbingly similar to predatory grooming."

What an insult to anyone who has ever worn a uniform in defense of our nation, especially those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of freedom. The ultimate goal

of Hagopian—who was behind the first successful effort to close the door on military recruiters in high schools—and others who share the same viewpoint is nothing less than a complete, across-the-board prohibition against military recruiters.

Meanwhile, some school administrators have creatively interpreted notification and consent requirements in the interest of limiting campus visits or access to student contact information. There are numerous examples of this occurring, but a recent decision by the San Diego Unified School District, which incorporates several high schools in my congressional district, restricts all recruiters—military and private—to only two visits a year and needlessly complicates recruiter-student interaction.

This decision is in fact consistent with federal law since military recruiters are provided the exact same access as private recruiters. But most private recruiters interface with students far less regularly than military recruiters. Often time, private recruiter interactions are limited to college or career fairs, instead relying on other forms of advertising and outreach. Military recruiters on the other hand have a steadier presence in high schools and, while it is absolutely necessary that these recruiters follow school guidelines and not interfere with individual learning, decisions like this, whether intended or not, are a significant step toward shutting the door on our military.

When it comes to "opting-out," students and parents should make that decision on their own, without undue influence from activists and administrators with anti-military bias. Families that recognize and honor the commitment of our military to defending freedom should not be represented by the small minority of those who actively seek to marginalize or even denigrate the armed forces.

The legislation I am introducing protects the rights of parents and students to opt-out while also maintaining military recruiter access to high school campuses and directories. Schools would still be obligated to notify parents and students of their options, ensuring there is a mechanism in place that prevents contact information from being released.

The alternative suggested by some of my colleagues, in anticipation of the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is to create an opt-in process. In other words, military recruiters would be denied access to student information unless a parent sends in a release authorization form. They question whether the recruitment provision violates a student's right to privacy, even though it's consistent with federal law and court-tested privacy rights. An analysis by the Congressional Research Service acknowledges this fact, noting that, unlike medical records, the basic information available to recruiters is no different than information "typically found in a phone book."

The Fairness for Military Recruiters Act specifically prohibits the implementation of an opt-in process and clarifies the notification and consent requirement by placing the personal information and career interests of students firmly in the control of parents.

Mr. Speaker, our national security hinges on brave Americans coming forward to volunteer for military service. Restricting recruiter access to high schools would not only reduce the quality and effectiveness of the military, but